arXiv:1406.4255v1 [math.AP] 17 Jun 2014

TWO DIMENSIONAL SUBSONIC FLOWS WITH SELF-GRAVITATION IN BOUNDED DOMAIN

MYOUNGJEAN BAE, BEN DUAN, AND CHUNJING XIE

Abstract. We investigate two dimensional steady Euler-Poisson system which describe the motion of compressible self-gravitating flows. The unique existence and stability of subsonic flows in a duct of finite length are obtained when prescribing the entropy at the entrance and the pressure at the exit. After introducing the stream function, the Euler-Poisson system can be decomposed into several transport equations and a second order nonlinear elliptic system. We discover an energy estimate for the associated elliptic system which is a key ingredient to prove the unique existence and stability of subsonic flow.

1. Introduction and Main Results

The motion of self-gravitating flows can be described by the Euler-Poisson system

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ (\rho \mathbf{u})_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} + p\mathbf{I}) = -\rho \nabla \Phi, \\ (\rho \mathbf{u} E)_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}(E + \dfrac{p}{\rho})) = -\rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \Phi, \\ \Delta \Phi = \rho, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\operatorname{div}, \nabla$, and Δ are the divergence, gradient, and Laplacian operators with respect to spatial variables $\mathrm{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The unkowns $\rho, \mathbf{u}, p, E$ and Φ in (1.1) represent the density, velocity, pressure, total energy of the fluid and gravitational potential function, respectively. $\mathbf{I}$ is an $n \times n$ identity matrix. For ideal polytropic gas, (1.1) is closed with the aid of definition of total energy E by

$$E = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \frac{p}{(\gamma - 1)\rho},$$

where $\gamma > 1$ is the adiabatic constant.

The blowup of classical solutions and the existence of global weak radial solutions for the system (1.1) were obtained in [20, 24]. The global well-posedness for (1.1) in general

Date: June 18, 2014.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J47, 35J57, 35J66, 35M10, 76N10.
Key words and phrases. Euler-Poisson system, subsonic flow, gravitational, stream function, existence, stability, elliptic system, $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity, Lipschitz boundary.

multidimensional setting is an outstanding challenging problem. Two important classes of isentropic steady solutions of (1.1) were studied extensively previously. The first is the non-rotating star solutions which have zero velocity, see [6]. The second is the rotating star solutions whose velocity fields are axially symmetric, [5, 7, 9, 13, 17, 18, 21], etc. The stability and instability of non-rotating and rotating star solutions were investigated in [11, 15, 19, 22], and references therein.

In this paper we focus on structural stability of steady subsonic solutions to (1.1) when the boundary data are two dimensional small perturbations of one dimensional solutions. In $\mathbb{R}^2$, let u and v denote the horizontal and vertical components of the velocity $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$. Then, the steady Euler-Poisson system is written as

$$\begin{cases} (\rho u)_x + (\rho v)_y = 0, \\ (\rho u^2 + p)_x + (\rho uv)_y = -\rho \Phi_x, \\ (\rho uv)_x + (\rho v^2 + p)_y = -\rho \Phi_y, \\ (\rho u \mathscr{B})_x + (\rho v \mathscr{B})_y = -\rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \Phi, \\ \Delta \Phi = \rho, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where the Bernoulli function $\mathscr{B}$ is given by

$$\mathscr{B} = E + \frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)\rho}.$$

Set

$$S = \ln \frac{p}{\rho^\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{K} = \mathscr{B} + \Phi. \tag{1.3}$$

S is the entropy, and we call $\mathscr{K}$ *the pseudo-Bernoulli function*. $(\rho, u, v, p, \Phi) \in (C^1)^4 \times C^2$ solve (1.2) if and only if they solve

$$(\rho u)_{x_1} + (\rho v)_{x_2} = 0, \tag{1.4}$$

$$(\rho uv)_{x_1} + (\rho v^2 + p)_{x_2} = -\rho \Phi_{x_2}, \tag{1.5}$$

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla S = 0, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathscr{K} = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

$$\Delta \Phi = \rho, \tag{1.8}$$

for $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$ provided that $\rho > 0$ and $u > 0$.

As a nonlinear system for (ρ, u, v, p), (1.4)–(1.7) form a mixed type system, and its type depends on *the Mach number* M which is given by $M = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|}{c}$ with $c(\rho, p) = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma p}{\rho}}$. Here, c is called the *local sound speed*. If $M < 1$, the flow is said to be *subsonic*, then (1.4)–(1.7) form an elliptic-hyperbolic coupled system. If $M > 1$, the flow is said to be *supersonic*

and (1.4)–(1.7) form a hyperbolic system. In addition, the Poisson's equation (1.8) has a nonlocal effect to the other equations (1.4)-(1.7), and it makes the fluid variables $\rho, \mathbf{u}, p$ and gravitational potential Φ interact in a highly nonlinear way.

The goal of this paper is to prove unique existence and stability of subsonic flows for (1.4)-(1.8) in a duct when the entrance entropy and the exit pressure are prescribed by two dimensional small perturbations of one dimensional solutions. For that purpose, we first study the one dimensional solutions of (1.4)-(1.8).

1.1. **One dimensional solutions of** (1.4)**-**(1.8)**.** Consider a solution (ρ, u, v, p, Φ) of (1.4)-(1.8) with $v = 0 = \Phi_{x_2}$, $\rho > 0$ and $u > 0$. Set $G := \Phi_{x_1}$. Then (ρ, u, S, G) satisfy

$$(\rho u)' = 0, \tag{1.9}$$

$$S' = 0, \tag{1.10}$$

$$\mathscr{B}' = -G, \tag{1.11}$$

$$G' = \rho, \tag{1.12}$$

where $'$ denotes the derivative with respect to x_1. It follows from (1.9) and (1.10) that one has

$$u = \frac{m_0}{\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad S = S_0 \tag{1.13}$$

with the constants $m_0 > 0$ and $S_0 > 0$ determined by the data at the entrance. Then (1.11) and (1.12) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \rho' = \frac{-\rho G}{\gamma e^{S_0}\rho^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2}{\rho^2}}, \\ G' = \rho. \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

For fixed constants $\gamma > 1$, $m_0 > 0$, and $S_0 > 0$, set

$$\rho_c = \left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma e^{S_0}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}.$$

Proposition 1.1. *Fix constants $\gamma > 1$, $m_0 > 0$ and $S_0 > 0$.*

(a) *For any given $\rho_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0, \rho_c\}$ and $G_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists an $\bar{L} > 0$ depending on γ, m_0, S_0, ρ_0, G_0 such that the ODE system* (1.14) *with initial conditions*

$$\rho(0) = \rho_0 \quad \textit{and} \quad G(0) = G_0 \tag{1.15}$$

has a unique smooth solution (ρ, G) on the interval $[0, L]$ whenever $L \le \bar{L}$, and

$$\lim_{x_1 \to \bar{L}-} (\rho, G) = (\rho_c, G_M)$$

with

$$G_M = \sqrt{2\left(e^{S_0}\rho_0^\gamma + \frac{m_0^2}{\rho_0} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}\left(\frac{m_0}{\gamma e^{S_0}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} m_0^2\right) + G_0^2}. \tag{1.16}$$

(b) *Let* $\bar{L}(\rho_0, G_0)$ *be the lifespan of the initial value problem* (1.14) *and* (1.15). *If* $\gamma > 2$, *then*

$$\lim_{\rho_0 \to \infty} \bar{L}(\rho_0, G_0) = \infty.$$

In other words, if $\gamma > 2$, *for any* $L > 0$, *there exists a nonempty set* $\mathfrak{P}_1 \subset (\rho_c, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ *depending on* γ, m_0, S_0, L *so that whenever* $(\rho_0, G_0) \in \mathfrak{P}_1$, *the problem* (1.14) *and* (1.15) *has a unique smooth solution* (ρ, G) *on the interval* $[0, L]$.

Proof. The right hand sides of (1.14) are smooth functions of (ρ, G) unless $\rho = \rho_c$. So the unique existence theorem of ODEs implies that if $\rho_0 \neq \rho_c$, then (1.14) with (1.15) is uniquely solvable on $[0, L]$ for a small $L > 0$.

If $(\rho, G) \in (C^1([0, L]))^2$ solve (1.14) and (1.15), then

$$H(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}G^2 = H(\rho_0) + \frac{1}{2}G_0^2 \tag{1.17}$$

holds on $[0, L]$ for $H(\rho)$ defined by

$$H(\rho) = \int_{\rho_c}^{\rho} \gamma e^{S_0} \varrho^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2}{\varrho^2}\, d\varrho = e^{S_0}\rho^\gamma + \frac{m_0^2}{\rho} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}\left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma e^{S_0}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} m_0^2. \tag{1.18}$$

It is easy to check that

$$H(\rho) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{sgn} H'(\rho) = \operatorname{sgn}(\rho - \rho_c) \ \text{ for } \ \rho > 0. \tag{1.19}$$

Thus we can draw the phase plane as Figure 1.



FIGURE 1. Left: $\rho_0 > \rho_c$, Right: $0 < \rho_0 < \rho_c$

It follows from (1.19) that there exists a unique ρ_M satisfying

$$H(\rho_M) = H(\rho_0) + \frac{1}{2}G_0^2 \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho_M - \rho_c)(\rho_0 - \rho_c) > 0.$$

It is obvious that $(\rho_M, 0)$ and (ρ_c, G_M) with G_M defined in (1.16) lie on the curve of (1.17). Suppose that $\rho_0 > \rho_c$. Then the initial value problem (1.14) and (1.15) has a unique smooth solution (ρ, G) as long as $G < G_M$. Fix a small constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}(G_M - G_0)$. Then the initial value problem (1.14) and (1.15) has a unique smooth solution on the interval $[0, L_\varepsilon]$ where $G(L_\varepsilon) = G_M - \varepsilon$ and $\rho(L_\varepsilon) > \rho_c$. Since $\rho > \rho_c$, it follows from the equation (1.12) that

$$L_\varepsilon < \frac{G_M - G_0}{\rho_c}.$$

Note that L_ε continuously increases as $\varepsilon > 0$ decreases to 0. Therefore, there exists a constant $\bar{L} \in (0, \frac{G_M - G_0}{\rho_c}]$ depending on γ, m_0, S_0, ρ_0, G_0 such that

$$\bar{L} = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} L_\varepsilon.$$

Since G tends to G_M as x_1 converges to $\bar{L}-$, the identity (1.17) implies that ρ tends to ρ_c at the same time. This proves (a) for the case $\rho_0 > \rho_c$. The case $\rho_0 < \rho_c$ can be proved similarly to obtain (a), so we omit details.

To prove (b), we need to estimate a lower bound of $\bar{L}$. Fix $\gamma > 2$ and $\rho_0 > \rho_c$. For a small $\varepsilon > 0$, it follows from $G' = \rho$ that

$$L_\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{\rho_M} \int_0^{L_\varepsilon} \rho(x_1)\, dx_1 = \frac{G_M - G_0 - \varepsilon}{\rho_M} \tag{1.20}$$

Letting $\varepsilon > 0$ go to 0 in (1.20) yields

$$\bar{L}(\rho_0) \geq \frac{G_M - G_0}{\rho_M} \geq \frac{G_M}{\rho_M} - \frac{G_0}{\rho_0}$$

where $\rho_M > \rho_0$ is used. It follows from (1.17) and (1.18) that $\frac{G_M}{\rho_M}$ can be represented as

$$\frac{G_M}{\rho_M} = \sqrt{\frac{2H(\rho_M)}{\rho_M^2}}.$$

Fix G_0 and let ρ_0 tend to infinity. Then, ρ_M tends to infinity as well. The explicit form of $H(\rho)$ in (1.18), together with $\gamma > 2$, gives

$$\lim_{\rho_M \to \infty} \frac{G_M}{\rho_M} = \infty.$$

This proves (b).

□

Lemma 1.2. *Given $\rho_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0, \rho_c\}$ and $G_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\bar{L}$ be from (a) of Proposition 1.1. Then the solution (ρ, G) of (1.14) and (1.15) satisfies*

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\rho - \rho_c) = \operatorname{sgn}(\rho_0 - \rho_c) \quad on \quad [0, \bar{L}).$$

Therefore, for any $L \in (0, \bar{L})$, there exists a constant $\nu_0 > 0$ depending on γ, m_0, S_0, ρ_0, G_0 and L such that

$$(\gamma e^{S_0}\rho^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2}{\rho^2})\operatorname{sgn}(\rho_0 - \rho_c) \geq \nu_0 \ \ on \ \ [0, L]. \tag{1.21}$$

Proof. The lemma is a direct consequence of the equation (1.12), the identity (1.17), and the property (1.19). □

1.2. **Main theorems.** Given $\gamma > 1$, $S_0 > 0$ and $m_0 > 0$, let (ρ, G) solve (1.14) and (1.15) with $\rho_0 > \rho_c$ on $[0, L]$ for some $L < \bar{L}$. Define $\Omega_L := (0, L) \times (-1, 1)$. The boundary $\partial\Omega_L$ consists of

$$\Gamma_0 = \partial\Omega_L \cap \{x_1 = 0\}, \quad \Gamma_L = \partial\Omega_L \cap \{x_1 = L\}, \quad \Gamma_w = \partial\Omega_L \setminus (\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_L).$$

For $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_L$, set

$$(\bar{\rho}(\mathrm{x}), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\mathrm{x}), \bar{p}(\mathrm{x})) := (\rho(x_1), u(x_1), 0, p(x_1)) \tag{1.22}$$

where u is given in (1.13) and $p = e^{S_0}\rho^\gamma$. Define

$$\Phi_0(\mathrm{x}) := \int_0^{x_1} G(t)dt - \left(\frac{m_0^2}{2\rho_0^2} + \frac{\gamma e^{S_0}\rho_0^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma - 1}\right). \tag{1.23}$$

Then $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{p}, \Phi_0)(\mathrm{x})$ satisfy (1.4)–(1.8) in Ω_L. Also, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ and Φ_0 satisfy

$$\bar{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \mathbf{n}_w = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla\Phi_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}_w = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_w$$

where $\mathbf{n}_w$ is the inward unit normal of Γ_w. Furthermore, by the definition (1.23) of Φ_0, we have

$$\bar{\mathscr{B}} + \Phi_0 \equiv 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L,$$

for

$$\bar{\mathscr{B}} = \frac{1}{2}|\bar{\mathbf{u}}|^2 + \frac{\gamma\bar{p}}{(\gamma - 1)\bar{\rho}}, \quad \mathscr{B}_0 = \bar{\mathscr{B}}(0).$$

Definition 1.3. *For fixed $\gamma > 1$, $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{p}, \Phi_0)$ given by (1.22) is called the background solution corresponding to (S_0, m_0, ρ_0, G_0).*

Our aim is to prove stability of the background solution $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{p}, \Phi_0)$ under two dimensional small perturbations of boundary data. Before we state our main problem and main theorems, weighted Hölder norms are introduced first. For a bounded connected open set

$\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, let Γ be a closed portion of $\partial\mathcal{O}$. For $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathcal{O}$, set

$$\delta_{\mathrm{x}} := \mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{x}, \Gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\mathrm{x,y}} := \min(\delta_{\mathrm{x}}, \delta_{\mathrm{y}}).$$

For $k \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, define the standard Hölder norms by

$$\|u\|_{m,\mathcal{O}} := \sum_{0\le|\beta|\le m} \sup_{\mathrm{x}\in\mathcal{O}} |D^\beta u(\mathrm{x})|, \quad [u]_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}} := \sum_{|\beta|=m} \sup_{\mathrm{x},\mathrm{y}\in\mathcal{O},\mathrm{x}\neq\mathrm{y}} \frac{|D^\beta u(\mathrm{x}) - D^\beta u(\mathrm{y})|}{|\mathrm{x}-\mathrm{y}|^\alpha},$$

and the weighted Hölder norms by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|^{(k,\Gamma)}_{m,0,\mathcal{O}} &:= \sum_{0\le|\beta|\le m} \sup_{\mathrm{x}\in\mathcal{O}} \delta_{\mathrm{x}}^{\max(|\beta|+k,0)} |D^\beta u(\mathrm{x})|,\\
[u]^{(k,\Gamma)}_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}} &:= \sum_{|\beta|=m} \sup_{\mathrm{x},\mathrm{y}\in\mathcal{O},\mathrm{x}\neq\mathrm{y}} \delta_{\mathrm{x,y}}^{\max(m+\alpha+k,0)} \frac{|D^\beta u(\mathrm{x}) - D^\beta u(\mathrm{y})|}{|\mathrm{x}-\mathrm{y}|^\alpha},\\
\|u\|_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}} &:= \|u\|_{m,\mathcal{O}} + [u]_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}}, \quad \|u\|^{(k,\Gamma)}_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}} := \|u\|^{(k,\Gamma)}_{m,0,\mathcal{O}} + [u]^{(k,\Gamma)}_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}},
\end{aligned}$$

where D^β denotes $\partial_{x_1}^{\beta_1}\partial_{x_2}^{\beta_2}$ for a multi-index $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ with $\beta_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $|\beta| = \beta_1 + \beta_2$. $C^{m,\alpha}_{(k,\Gamma)}(\mathcal{O})$ denotes the completion of the set of all smooth functions whose $\|\cdot\|^{(k,\Gamma)}_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}}$ norms are finite. For simplicity of notations, let $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha,\mathcal{O}}$ denote $\|\cdot\|_{0,\alpha,\mathcal{O}}$. For a vector function $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \cdots, v_n)$, define $\|\mathbf{v}\|^{k,\Gamma}_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \|v_i\|^{k,\Gamma}_{m,\alpha,\mathcal{O}}$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{W^{k,p}(\mathcal{O})} = \sum_{i=1}^n \|v_i\|_{W^{k,p}(\mathcal{O})}$.

Main Problem. *Fix a constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$. For given functions $(\Phi_{bd}, p_{ex}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, S_{en})$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|G_{en} - G_0\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_0)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0} + \|\mathscr{B}_{en} - \mathscr{B}_0\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_0)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0} + \|S_{en} - S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0}\\
+ \|\Phi_{bd} - \Phi_0\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Gamma_L} + \|p_{ex} - \bar{p}(L)\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L} \le \sigma
\end{aligned} \tag{1.24}$$

for a sufficiently small constant $\sigma > 0$, find a solution (ρ, u, v, p, Φ) of (1.2) in Ω_L with boundary conditions

$$v = 0,\ \Phi_{x_1} = G_{en},\ S = S_{en},\ \mathscr{B} = \mathscr{B}_{en} \qquad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0, \tag{1.25}$$

$$(u, v)\cdot\mathbf{n}_w = \nabla\Phi\cdot\mathbf{n}_w = 0 \qquad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_w, \tag{1.26}$$

$$p = p_{ex},\ \Phi = \Phi_{bd} \qquad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L, \tag{1.27}$$

where $\mathbf{n}_w$ is the inward unit normal vector on Γ_w.

Before stating our main results, we introduce the following notations. Fix constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\mu > 1$. For functions $(\Phi_{bd}, G_{en}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex}) \in C^2(\Omega_L) \times [C^1(\Gamma_0)]^3 \times C^1(\Gamma_L)$,

set

$$\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex}) := \|G_{en}-G_0\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_0)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0} + \|S_{en}-S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0} + \|\mathscr{B}_{en}-\mathscr{B}_0\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_0)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0} + \|\Phi_{bd}-\Phi_0\|^{(-1-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}_{2,\alpha,\Gamma_L} + \|p_{ex}-\bar{p}(L)\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L},$$

$$\omega_2(\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en}) := \|S_{en}-S_0\|_{W^{2,\mu}(\Gamma_0)} + \|\mathscr{B}_{en}+\Phi_{bd}\|_{W^{2,\mu}(\Gamma_L)}.$$

The main results of this paper is as follows:

Theorem 1. *Fix $\gamma>1$, and let $(\bar\rho,\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar p,\Phi_0)$ be the background solution corresponding to (S_0,m_0,ρ_0,G_0) in Ω_L with $\rho_0>\rho_c$. Suppose that the background solution satisfies*

$$\frac{\bar\rho L^2}{2(\gamma e^{S_0}\bar\rho^{\gamma-1}-\frac{m_0^2}{\bar\rho^2})} \le 1-\delta_0 \quad in \quad \Omega_L \tag{1.28}$$

for some constant $\delta_0\in(0,1)$.

(a)[Existence] Suppose that Φ_{bd} satisfies the compatibility condition

$$\partial_{x_2}\Phi_{bd}=0 \quad on \quad \overline{\Gamma_w}\cap\overline{\Gamma_L}. \tag{1.29}$$

Then there exists a small constant σ_1 depending on γ, m_0, S_0, ρ_0, G_0, L, δ_0 and α such that if

$$\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex})\le\sigma_1 \tag{1.30}$$

for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$, then the nonlinear boundary value problem (1.2) with boundary conditions (1.25)–(1.27) has a solution $(\rho,u,v,p,\Phi)\in[C(\overline{\Omega_L})\cap C^1(\Omega_L)]^4\times(C^1(\overline{\Omega_L})\cap C^2(\Omega_L))$ satisfying the estimate

$$\|(\rho,u,v,p)-(\bar\rho,\bar u,0,\bar p)\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L}+\|\Phi-\Phi_0\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}\le C\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex}), \tag{1.31}$$

where the constant C is determined by γ, m_0, ρ_0, G_0, S_0, L, δ_0 and α.

(b) [Uniqueness] There exists $\sigma_2>0$ depending on γ, m_0, ρ_0, G_0, S_0, L, δ_0, α and μ such that if

$$\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex})+\omega_2(\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en})\le\sigma_2,$$

with $\alpha\in(\frac12,1)$ and $\mu\in(2,\infty)$, then the solution $(\rho,\mathbf{u},p,\Phi)$ obtained in (a) is unique.

Remark 1.4. *There are a large class of background solutions for which the condition (1.28) holds. For example, we can obtain background solutions satisfying (1.28) in the following two cases.*

(i) *For any given $m_0>0,\gamma>1,G_0$ and $\rho_0(>\rho_c)$, if L is suitably small, then the condition (1.28) holds.*

(ii) *Suppose that* $\gamma > 2$. *Let* $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{G})$ *be a background solution with* $\rho_0 > \rho_c$. *If* $\bar{G} \le 0$ *in* Ω_L, *then*

$$\max_{\overline{\Omega_L}} \frac{\bar{\rho}}{\gamma e^{S_0} \bar{\rho}^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2}{\bar{\rho}^2}} \le \frac{\rho_0}{\gamma e^{S_0} \rho_0^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2}{\rho_0^2}} \to 0 \quad as \quad \rho_0 \to \infty.$$

Therefore, one can choose $\rho_0 > \rho_c$ *large depending on* γ, m_0, S_0, G_0, L *so that* (1.28) *holds.*

Remark 1.5. *Theorem 1 is proved by a fixed point method, and* (1.28) *is needed to guarantee the well-posedness of a linear elliptic system boundary value problem* (3.1)–(3.3) *related to* (1.4)–(1.8). *If the condition* (1.28) *is violated, in general, the associated boundary value problem with linear elliptic system may not be wellposed.*

The main idea to prove Theorem 1 is to introduce a stream function ψ which reduces (1.2) to a nonlinear elliptic system for (ψ, Ψ) and two transport equations for $(S, \mathscr{K})$. The second order elliptic system for (ψ, Ψ) is solved with the aid of its elaborate structure. The technique of this work was inspired by the study on two dimensional subsonic Euler equations [25] and subsonic Euler-Poisson system modeling the flows in semiconductor devices [2].

In the rest of the paper, we say that a constant C depends on the background data if C is chosen depending on γ, m_0, S_0, ρ_0, G_0, and L. Hereafter, any constant $C > 0$ appearing in various estimates is presumed to depend on the background data unless otherwise specified.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Using a stream function ψ, (1.2) is reduced to a nonlinear second order elliptic system for (ψ, Φ) and transport equations for S and $\mathscr{K}$ in Section 2. Various a priori estimates and the existence of solutions to the linear boundary value problems are given in Section 3. We give the proof for Theorem 2, an equivalence of Theorem 1, in Section 4.

2. Stream function formulation for the problem

2.1. **Stream function formulation and Proof of Theorem 1.** We will prove Theorem 1 for σ_1 sufficiently small so that any solution (ρ, u, v, p, Φ) satisfying (1.31) satisfies $\rho > 0, u > 0$. In that case, (1.2) is equivalent to (1.4)–(1.8).

Suppose that $(\rho, u, v, p, \Phi) \in [C^1(\Omega)]^4 \times C^2(\Omega)$ is a solution to (1.4)–(1.8). By (1.4), there is a C^2 function ψ satisfying

$$\rho(u, v) = \nabla^\perp \psi \quad \text{where} \quad \nabla^\perp := (\partial_{x_2}, -\partial_{x_1}). \tag{2.1}$$

Note that there is a freedom of choice for the value of $\psi(0,-1)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\psi(0,-1)=0$. It follows from (1.3) and (2.1) that

$$\mathcal{G}(\rho,\nabla\psi,\Phi,S,\mathscr{K})=0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L, \tag{2.2}$$

where for $\boldsymbol{q}=(q_1,q_2)$, $\mathcal{G}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(\varsigma,\boldsymbol{q},z,s,\eta)=\frac{|\boldsymbol{q}|^2}{\varsigma^2}+\frac{\gamma\varsigma^{\gamma-1}\exp(s)}{\gamma-1}+z-\eta. \tag{2.3}$$

If $\rho>0$ and $u>0$, (1.5) is equivalent to

$$v_{x_1}-u_{x_2}=\left(\frac{e^S\rho^{\gamma-1}S_{x_2}}{\gamma-1}-\mathscr{K}_{x_2}\right)\frac{1}{u}.$$

This, together with (2.1), gives

$$\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\nabla\psi}{\rho}\right)=\left(\mathscr{K}_{x_2}-\frac{Q^{\gamma-1}\exp(S)S_{x_2}}{\gamma-1}\right)\frac{\rho}{\psi_{x_2}}. \tag{2.4}$$

It follows from (2.1) that if $\rho>0$, then the equations (1.6) and (1.7) can be written as

$$\nabla^\perp\psi\cdot\nabla S=0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^\perp\psi\cdot\nabla\mathscr{K}=0, \tag{2.5}$$

respectively. Finally, the boundary conditions (1.25)–(1.27) can be formulated as the boundary conditions for $(\rho,\psi,\Phi,S,\mathscr{K})$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \psi_x=0,\ \Phi_{x_1}=G_{en},\ S=S_{en},\ \mathscr{K}=\mathscr{B}_{en}+\Phi_{bd} \text{ on } \Gamma_0,\\ \psi_{x_1}=0,\ \Phi_{x_2}=0 \text{ on } \Gamma_w,\\ e^S\rho^\gamma=p_{ex},\ \Phi=\Phi_{bd} \text{ on } \Gamma_L. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

Under the condition of $\rho>0, u>0$, (ρ,u,v,p,Φ) solve (1.2) in Ω_L with (1.25)–(1.27) if and only if $(\rho,\psi,\Phi,S,\mathscr{K})$ solve (1.8), (2.4), (2.5) in Ω_L with (2.6).

Define

$$\psi_0(x_1,x_2)=m_0(x_2+1) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L. \tag{2.7}$$

Then, $(\psi,\Phi,\rho,S,\mathscr{K})=(\psi_0,\Phi_0,\bar\rho,S_0,0)$ satisfy the system (1.8), (2.4), and (2.5) with boundary conditions (2.6) where $(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex})=(G_0,\Phi_0,S_0,\mathscr{B}_0,\bar p(L))$.

Theorem 2. *Fix $\gamma>1$, and let $(\bar\rho,\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar p,\Phi_0)$ be the background solution corresponding to (S_0,m_0,ρ_0,G_0) in Ω_L with $\rho_0>\rho_c$. Suppose that the background solution satisfies* (1.28).

(a) *[Existence] Suppose that Φ_{bd} satisfies* (1.29). *Then there exist $\sigma_3>0$ small and $C>0$ depending on the background data, δ_0 and α such that if $\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex})\le\sigma_3$ holds, then the nonlinear boundary value problem* (1.8), (2.4), (2.5), *and* (2.6)

has a solution $(\psi, \Phi, \rho, S, \mathscr{K}) \in [C^2(\Omega_L)]^2 \times [C^1(\Omega_L)]^3$*, which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\psi-\psi_0, \Phi-\Phi_0)\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|(\rho-\bar\rho, S-S_0, \mathscr{K})\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} \\ \le& C\omega_1(G_{en}, \Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

(b) *[Uniqueness] There exists a constant* $\sigma_4 > 0$ *depending on the background data,* δ_0*,* α *and* μ *such that if*

$$\omega_1(G_{en}, \Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex}) + \omega_2(\Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}) \le \sigma_4, \tag{2.9}$$

with $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ *and* $\mu \in (2, \infty)$*, then the solution* $(\rho, \psi, \Phi, S, \mathscr{K})$ *obtained in (a) is unique.*

Once Theorem 2 is proved, then Theorem 1 easily follows from Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 1. Suppose that Theorem 2 is true, then fix $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = (\sigma_3, \sigma_4)$ for (σ_3, σ_4) from Theorem 2. Given $(G_{en}, \Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex})$ satisfying (1.29) and (1.30), let $(\psi, \Phi, \rho, S, \mathscr{K})$ be a solution to (1.8), (2.4), (2.5), and (2.6). Since σ_3 is suitably small, the estimate (2.8) implies that $\rho > 0$. Set $\mathbf{u} = \frac{\nabla^\perp \psi}{\rho}$ and $p = e^S \rho^\gamma$. Then, $(\rho, \mathbf{u}, p, \Phi)$ solve (1.2) with (1.25)–(1.27), and satisfy (1.31).

Given $(G_{en}, \Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex})$ satisfying (1.29) and (2.9), let $(\rho_1, u_1, v_1, p_1, \Phi_1)$ and $(\rho_2, u_2, v_2, p_2, \Phi_2)$ be two solutions of (1.2), (1.25)–(1.27) satisfying (1.31). For each $k = 1, 2$, define

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi_k(x_1, x_2) = \int_{-1}^{x_2} \rho_k u_k(x_1, s)\, ds, \\ &S_k = \ln \frac{p_k}{\rho_k^\gamma}, \quad \mathscr{K}_k = \frac{1}{2}(u_k^2 + v_k^2) + \frac{\gamma p_k}{(\gamma-1)\rho_k} + \Phi_k. \end{aligned}$$

Then, each $(\psi_k, \Phi_k, \rho_k, S_k, \mathscr{K}_k)$ is a solution to (1.8), (2.4), (2.5), (2.6), and satisfies (2.8). Then, Theorem 2(b) implies $(\psi_1, \Phi_1, \rho_1, S_1, \mathscr{K}_1) = (\psi_2, \Phi_2, \rho_2, S_2, \mathscr{K}_2)$ in Ω_L from which Theorem 1(b) follows. □

The rest of the paper is devoted to prove Theorem 2.

2.2. **Problem for the perturbations.** Let $(\bar\rho, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar p, \Phi_0)$ be a background solution satisfying all the assumptions in Theorem 2. By (2.3) and Lemma 1.2, there is a constant $\kappa_0 > 0$ depending on the background data to satisfy

$$\mathcal{G}_\varsigma(\bar\rho, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0) = \frac{1}{\bar\rho}\left(\gamma \bar\rho^{\gamma-1} \exp(S_0) - \frac{m_0^2}{\bar\rho^2}\right) \ge \kappa_0 > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega_L}. \tag{2.10}$$

For a constant $d > 0$, define

$$\mathscr{N}_d(\nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0) := \{(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, \mathscr{K}) \in [C^0(\overline{\Omega_L})]^5 : \\ \|(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, \mathscr{K}) - (\nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0)\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega_L})} < d\}.$$

Applying the implicit mapping theorem yields that there exists a constant $d_0 > 0$ depending on the background data so that for any $(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, \mathscr{K}) \in \mathscr{N}_{d_0}(\nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0)$, there exists a unique $Q(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, \mathscr{K})$ such that

$$\mathcal{G}(Q(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, \mathscr{K}), \boldsymbol{q}, z, S, \mathscr{K}) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L. \tag{2.11}$$

Therefore, if $(\nabla\psi, \Phi, S, \mathscr{K}) \in \mathscr{N}_{d_0}$, then (2.2) yields $\rho = Q(\nabla\psi, \Phi, S, \mathscr{K})$.

The transport equations for S and $\mathscr{K}$ in (2.5) can be solved in a similar way. Furthermore, S and $\mathscr{K}$ paly the similar role in the system (1.8) and (2.4). Therefore, to simplify the presentation, we assume

$$\mathscr{B}_{en} + \Phi_{bd} \equiv 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0 \tag{2.12}$$

so that $\mathscr{K} = 0$ and we focus on the study for the transport equation for S later on.

For $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_L$ and $(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, 0) \in \mathscr{N}_{d_0}(\nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0)$, define

$$A_j(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S) = \frac{q_j}{Q(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, 0)} \quad \text{for} \ \ j = 1, 2, \quad B(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S) = Q(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, 0) \tag{2.13}$$

where $(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S)$ are evaluated at x. From now on, we denote $\mathbf{A}(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S) = (A_1, A_2)(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S)$ and $B(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S)$ by

If $C\omega_1(G_{en}, \Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex}) \le \frac{d_0}{2}$ in Theorem 2, then it follows from (2.11) that (1.8) and (2.4) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{A}(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi, \Phi, S)) = -\dfrac{B^\gamma(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi, \Phi, S)e^S S_{x_2}}{(\gamma - 1)\psi_{x_2}}, \\ \Delta\Phi = B(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi, \Phi, S) \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

There exist $d_1 \in (0, d_0)$ and $C > 0$ depending only on the background data such that if $(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S, 0) \in \mathscr{N}_{d_1}(\nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0)$, then $(\mathbf{A}, B)(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S)$ are continuously differentiable with respect to $(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S)$, and they satisfy

$$|D_{(\boldsymbol{q}, z, S)}(\mathbf{A}, B)(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S)| \le C.$$

Set

$$(\phi, \Psi) := (\psi, \Phi) - (\psi_0, \Phi_0) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L.$$

Suppose that $(\nabla\psi, \Phi, S, 0) \in \mathscr{N}_{d_1}(\nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0)$. Then (ψ, Φ) satisfy (2.14) if and only if (ϕ, Ψ) satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\phi, \Psi) = f(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\phi, \Psi, S, S_{x_2}) + \mathrm{div}\boldsymbol{F}(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\phi, \Psi, S), \tag{2.15}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\phi, \Psi) = g(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\phi, \Psi, S), \tag{2.16}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$, f, $\boldsymbol{F} = (F_1, F_2)$ and g are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\phi, \Psi) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \partial_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} \partial_{q_j} A_i(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0)\partial_j\phi + \Psi\partial_z A_i(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0) \right), \tag{2.17}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\phi, \Psi) = \Delta\Psi - \Psi\partial_z B(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0) - \nabla\phi \cdot \partial_{\boldsymbol{q}} B(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0), \tag{2.18}$$

$$f(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S, S_{x_2}) = \frac{(S - S_0)_{x_2} B^{\gamma}(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0 + \boldsymbol{q}, \Phi_0 + z, S) e^{S_0 + (S - S_0)}}{(\gamma - 1)(m_0 + q_2)}, \tag{2.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S) = &\sum_{j=0}^{2} q_j \int_0^1 [\partial_{q_j} A_i(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0 + \tau\boldsymbol{q}, \Phi_0 + \tau z, S_0 + \tau(S - S_0))]_{\tau=t}^{0}\, dt \\ &- (S - S_0) \int_0^1 \partial_S A_i(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0 + t\boldsymbol{q}, \Phi_0 + tz, S_0 + t(S - S_0))\, dt, \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathrm{x}, \boldsymbol{q}, z, S) = &\sum_{j=0}^{2} q_j \int_0^1 [\partial_{q_j} B(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0 + \tau\boldsymbol{q}, \Phi_0 + \tau z, S_0 + \tau(S - S_0))]_{\tau=0}^{t}\, dt \\ &+ (S - S_0) \int_0^1 \partial_S B(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0 + t\boldsymbol{q}, \Phi_0 + tz, S_0 + t(S - S_0))\, dt \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

with $q_0 = z$. Here ∂_1 and ∂_2 denote ∂_{x_1} and ∂_{x_2}, respectively. And, $[k(\tau)]_{\tau=0}^{t}$ denotes $k(t) - k(0)$.

The transport equation for S in (2.5) and the associated boundary condition at Γ_0 can be written as

$$\nabla^{\perp}(\phi + \psi_0) \cdot \nabla S = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_L, \ S = S_{en} \text{ on } \Gamma_0. \tag{2.22}$$

Next, we compute boundary conditions for (ϕ, Ψ) corresponding to (2.6). Solve (2.2) for $|\nabla\psi|^2$ and substitute $(\rho, \Phi, \mathscr{K}) = ((\frac{p_{ex}}{e^S})^{1/\gamma}, \Phi_{bd}, 0)$ given from (2.6) so that we obtain the expression

$$|\nabla\psi|^2 = -2\left(\frac{p_{ex}}{e^S}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}} \left(\Phi_{bd} - \frac{\gamma e^{S/\gamma} p_{ex}^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma}}}{\gamma - 1} \right) \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L. \tag{2.23}$$

It follows from (2.7) that (2.23) can be written as a boundary condition for ϕ as follows:

$$\phi_{x_2} = -\frac{1}{m_0}\left(h_1(\mathrm{x}, S) + \frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{q}|^2 \right) =: h(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\phi, S) \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L \tag{2.24}$$

with $h_1(\mathrm{x}, S)$ defined by

$$h_1(\mathrm{x}, S) = \Big(\frac{p_{ex}}{e^S}\Big)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}} \left(\Phi_{bd} - \frac{\gamma p_{ex}^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma}} e^{S/\gamma}}{\gamma - 1}\right) - \left(\frac{\bar{p}(L)}{e^{S_0}}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}} \left(\Phi_0 - \frac{\gamma e^{S_0/\gamma} \bar{p}^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma}}(L)}{\gamma - 1}\right). \quad (2.25)$$

The rest of boundary conditions for (ψ, Φ) in (2.6) is written in terms of (ϕ, Ψ) as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \Psi_{x_1} = G_{en} - G_0 =: g_{en} \text{ on } \Gamma_0, \ \Psi = \Phi_{bd} - \Phi_0 =: \Psi_{bd} \text{ on } \Gamma_L, \quad \Psi_{x_2} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_w, \\ \phi(0, -1) = 0, \quad \phi_{x_1} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_0, \quad \phi_{x_1} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_w. \end{cases} \quad (2.26)$$

If $(\nabla\psi, \Phi, S, 0) \in \mathscr{N}_{d_1}(\nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0, 0)$ and $\psi_y \geq \frac{m_0}{10}$ in $\overline{\Omega}_L$, then $(\psi, \Phi, S, 0)$ solve (1.8), (2.4), (2.5), and (2.6) if and only if (ϕ, Ψ, S) solve (2.15), (2.16), (2.22), and (2.26). To prove Theorem 2, it suffices to solve the nonlinear boundary value problem (2.15), (2.16), (2.22), and (2.26) for (ϕ, Ψ, S) for $C\omega_1(G_{en}, \Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex}) \leq \min(\frac{d_1}{2}, \frac{m_0}{2})$.

Given S, the equations (2.17) and (2.18) form a nonlinear elliptic system for (ϕ, Ψ) provided that $\|\phi\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega_L})} + \|\Psi\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega_L})}$ is sufficiently small. Given ϕ with $\|\phi\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega_L})}$ small, (2.22) can be regarded as an initial value problem for S. Based on this observation, we prove solvability of (2.15), (2.16), (2.22), (2.26) by the method of iteration. For that purpose, it is crucial to study the boundary value problem for a linear elliptic system associated with (2.15), (2.16), and (2.26).

3. Linear boundary value problem

Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Given $\mathfrak{f} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega_L})$, $\mathfrak{g} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega_L})$, $g_{en} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Gamma_0})$, $\mathfrak{h} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Gamma_L})$ and $\mathfrak{F} \in (C^{1,\alpha}_{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}(\Omega_L))^2$, consider the linear boundary value problem,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1(\phi, \Psi) = \mathfrak{f} + \mathrm{div}\mathfrak{F} \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\phi, \Psi) = \mathfrak{g} \end{cases} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L \quad (3.1)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\Psi_{x_1} = g_{en} \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \ \Psi = \Psi_{bd} \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_L, \quad \Psi_{x_2} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_w, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\phi(0, -1) = 0, \ \phi_{x_1} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_0, \ \phi_{x_1} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_w, \ \phi_{x_2} = \mathfrak{h} \text{ on } \Gamma_L. \quad (3.3)$$

If $\phi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_L})$, then the boundary conditions (3.3) are equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{x_1} = 0 & \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0, \\ \phi(x_1, -1) = 0, \quad \phi(x_1, 1) = \int_{-1}^1 \mathfrak{h}(z)\, dz & \text{on} \quad \Gamma_w, \\ \phi(L, x_2) = \int_{-1}^{x_2} \mathfrak{h}(z)\, dz & \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

So we consider the boundary value problem (3.1), (3.2) and (3.4) in the rest of this section.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ be defined by* (2.17) *and* (2.18) *for a background solution $(\bar\rho, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar p, \Phi_0)$ satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 2. Then there exists a unique solution $(\phi, \Psi) \in [C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega_L}) \cap C^2(\Omega_L)]^2$ to* (3.1), (3.2) *and* (3.4) *satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\phi,\Psi)\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L} \le & C\Big(\|(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{g})\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|\mathfrak{F}\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|g_{en}\|^{(-1-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_0)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0} \\ & + \|\Psi_{bd}\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|\mathfrak{h}\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where the constant C depends only on the background data and α.

For $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_L$, define

$$\Psi^*_{bd}(\mathrm{x}) := \Psi_{bd}(L, x_2), \qquad \mathfrak{H}(x_1, x_2) = \int_{-1}^{x_2} \mathfrak{h}(z)\, dz.$$

If $\Psi_{bd} \in C^{2,\alpha}_{(-1-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}(\Gamma_L)$ satisfies (1.29), then one has

$$(\Psi - \Psi^*_{bd})_{x_1} = g_{en} \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \Psi - \Psi^*_{bd} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_L, \quad \partial_{x_2}(\Psi - \Psi^*_{bd}) = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_w.$$

Set

$$\mathfrak{u}(x_1, x_2) := \phi(x_1, x_2) - \mathfrak{H}(x_1, x_2), \quad \mathcal{V}(x_1, x_2) := \Psi(x_1, x_2) - \Psi^*_{bd}(x_1, x_2). \tag{3.6}$$

To simplify notations, we write

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}(\mathrm{x}) &= \partial_{q_j} A_i(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0), \quad b_i(\mathrm{x}) = \partial_z A_i(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0) \\ c_i(\mathrm{x}) &= \partial_{q_i} B(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0), \qquad d(\mathrm{x}) = \partial_z B(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_0, \Phi_0, S_0) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2$. Note that a_{ij}, b_i, c_i and d are independent of x_2 for $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_L$.

Then (ϕ, Ψ) solve (3.1), (3.2) and (3.4) if and only if $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V})$ solve

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{f} + \mathrm{div}\mathfrak{F} - \mathcal{L}_1(\mathfrak{H}, \Psi^*_{bd}) =: \mathfrak{f} + \mathrm{div}\mathfrak{F}^* \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{g} - \mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{H}, \Psi^*_{bd}) =: \mathfrak{g}^* + \mathrm{div}\mathfrak{G}^* \end{cases} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L \tag{3.8}$$

with boundary conditions

$$\mathcal{V}_{x_1} = g_{en} \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \mathcal{V} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_L, \quad \mathcal{V}_{x_2} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_w, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\mathfrak{u}_{x_1} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \mathfrak{u} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_w \cup \Gamma_L, \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{F}^* = \mathfrak{F} - (0, a_{22}\partial_2\mathfrak{H}) - (b_1, b_2)\Psi^*_{bd}, \quad \mathfrak{G}^* = -\nabla\Psi^*_{bd}, \quad \mathfrak{g}^* = \mathfrak{g} + \Psi^*_{bd} d + c_2\partial_2\mathfrak{H}. \tag{3.11}$$

To prove Proposition 3.1, it suffices to show that (3.8)-(3.10) is uniquely solvable.

Lemma 3.2. *Let a_{ij}, b_i, c_i, and d be defined by* (3.7) *for a background solution $(\bar\rho, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar p, \Phi_0)$ satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 2. Then, they satisfy the following properties:*

(a) *The matrix* $[a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^2$ *is diagonal, and there exists a constant* $\lambda_0 > 0$ *satisfying*

$$\lambda_0|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \le \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} a_{ij}(\mathrm{x})\xi_i\xi_j \le \frac{1}{\lambda_0}|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \quad \textit{for all } \mathrm{x} \in \overline{\Omega_L} \textit{ and } \boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{3.12}$$

(b) *For each* $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, *there exists a constant* $\mathcal{C}_k$ *satisfying*

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \|a_{ij}\|_{k,\Omega_L} + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \|(b_i, c_i)\|_{k,\Omega_L} + \|d\|_{k,\Omega_L} \le \mathcal{C}_k.$$

(c) *For each* $i = 1, 2$, *we have*

$$b_i(\mathrm{x}) + c_i(\mathrm{x}) = 0 \quad \textit{in } \Omega_L.$$

(d) *For* $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$ *from* (1.28), d *satisfies*

$$-\frac{2}{L^2}(1 - \delta_0) \le d < 0 \quad \textit{in} \quad \Omega_L.$$

Here, λ_0 *depends on the data, and* $\mathcal{C}_k$ *depends on* k *and the data.*

Proof. The direct computations using (2.3), (2.13) and (3.7) give

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij} &= \frac{1}{\gamma e^{S_0}\bar{\rho}^{\gamma} - \frac{m_0^2}{\bar{\rho}}} \left((\gamma e^{S_0}\bar{\rho}^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2}{\bar{\rho}^2})\delta_{ij} + \frac{m_0^2\delta_{i2}\delta_{j2}}{\bar{\rho}^2} \right), \\ b_i &= -c_i = \frac{m_0\delta_{i2}}{\gamma e^{S_0}\bar{\rho}^{\gamma} - \frac{m_0^2}{\bar{\rho}}}, \quad d = \frac{-\bar{\rho}}{\gamma e^{S_0}\bar{\rho}^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2}{\bar{\rho}^2}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2$, where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol satisfying $\delta_{ij} = 1$ for $i = j$, $\delta_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Then (a)–(d) easily follow from (1.21), (1.28), (3.13) and Proposition 1.1. □

Define $\mathcal{H} = \{(\zeta, \omega) \in [H^1(\Omega_L)]^2 : \zeta = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_w \cup \Gamma_L, \omega = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_L\}$, which is a Hilbert space. If $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}) \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy

$$\mathfrak{L}[(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}), (\zeta, \omega)] = \langle (\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{F}^*, \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{G}^*, g_{en}), (\zeta, \omega) \rangle \tag{3.14}$$

for all $(\zeta, \omega) \in \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathfrak{L}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ are defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{L}[(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}), (\zeta, \omega)] = \int_{\Omega_L} \sum_{i=1}^{2} (a_{ii}\partial_i\mathfrak{u} + b_i\mathcal{V})\partial_i\zeta + \nabla\mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla\omega + (d\mathcal{V} + \sum_{i=1}^{2} c_i\partial_i\mathfrak{u})\omega \, d\mathrm{x} \tag{3.15}$$

and

$$\langle (\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{F}^*, \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{G}^*), (\zeta, \omega) \rangle = \int_{\Omega_L} \mathfrak{F}^* \cdot \nabla\zeta + \mathfrak{G}^* \cdot \nabla\omega \, d\mathrm{x} - \int_{\Omega_L} \mathfrak{f}\zeta + \mathfrak{g}^*\omega \, d\mathrm{x} + \int_{\Gamma_0} (\mathfrak{F}_1^*\zeta - g_{en}\omega) \, dx_2,$$

then we say that $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V})$ is a weak solution of (3.8)–(3.10). If $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}) \in [C^1(\overline{\Omega_L}) \cap C^2(\Omega_L)]^2$ solve (3.8), then they must be a weak solution.

Lemma 3.3. *Let a_{ij}, b_i, c_i, and d be defined by* (3.7) *for a background solution* $(\bar\rho, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar p, \Phi_0)$ *satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 2. Then* (3.8)–(3.10) *has a unique weak solution* $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}) \in \mathcal{H}$ *satisfying the estimate*

$$\|(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V})\|_{H^1(\Omega_L)} \le C(\|(\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{G}^*, \mathfrak{F}^*\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega_L})} + \|g_{en}\|_{C^0(\overline{\Gamma_0})}) \tag{3.16}$$

where the constant C depends only on the data and δ_0.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2(c),

$$\mathfrak{L}[(\zeta,\omega),(\zeta,\omega)] = \int_{\Omega_L} \sum_{i=1}^{2} a_{ii}(\partial_i\zeta)^2 + |\nabla\omega|^2 + d\omega^2 \, d\mathrm{x}$$

holds for all $(\zeta,\omega) \in \mathcal{H}$. For each $w \in H^1(\Omega_L)$ with $w = 0$ on Γ_0, fundamental theorem of calculus and C^1-approximations of H^1 functions give

$$\int_{\Omega_L} w^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \le \frac{1}{2} L^2 \int_{\Omega_L} w_{x_1}^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \tag{3.17}$$

from which we get

$$\mathfrak{L}[(\zeta,\omega),(\zeta,\omega)] \ge \int_{\Omega_L} \sum_{i=1}^{2} a_{ii}(\partial_i\zeta)^2 + (1 - \frac{L^2}{2}\|d\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega_L})})|\nabla\omega|^2 \, d\mathrm{x}.$$

It follows from (3.12) and (1.28) that

$$\mathfrak{L}[(\zeta,\omega),(\zeta,\omega)] \ge \int_{\Omega_L} \lambda_0|\nabla\zeta|^2 + \delta_0|\nabla\omega|^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \quad \text{for all } \ (\zeta,\omega) \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{3.18}$$

Combining (3.18) with Poincaré inequality yields

$$\mathfrak{L}[(\zeta,\omega),(\zeta,\omega)] \ge C\|(\zeta,\omega)\|^2_{H^1(\Omega_L)} \quad \text{for all } \ (\zeta,\omega) \in \mathcal{H}$$

for a constant C depending only on the data and δ_0. This implies that the bilinear operator $\mathfrak{L} : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ is coercive. Furthermore, it follows from Hölder inequality, trace inequality, and Poincaré inequality that

$$|\langle(\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{F}^*, \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{G}^*, g_{en}), (\zeta,\omega)\rangle| \le \hat C\|(\zeta,\omega)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}(\|(\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{G}^*, \mathfrak{F}^*\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega_L})} + \|g_{en}\|_{C^0(\overline{\Gamma_0})})$$

holds where the constant $\hat C > 0$ is independent of the data. Hence we can apply Lax-Milgram theorem to (3.14) to conclude that, for any given $(\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{G}^*, \mathfrak{F}^*, g_{en}) \in [C^0(\overline{\Omega_L})]^6 \times C^0(\overline{\Gamma_0})$, there exists a unique $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V}) \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying (3.14). Furthermore such $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{V})$ satisfy (3.16). □

Lemma 3.4. *For any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, there exists a constant $C_B > 0$ depending only on the background data, δ_0 and α such that whenever $(\mathfrak{F}^*, \mathfrak{G}^*, g_{en}) \in [C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega_L}, \mathbb{R}^2)]^4 \times C^\alpha(\overline{\Gamma_0})$, the*

weak solution $(\mathfrak{u},\mathcal{V})\in\mathcal{H}$ *of* (3.8)–(3.10) *satisfy*

$$\|(\mathfrak{u},\mathcal{V})\|_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L}\le C_B\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en}) \tag{3.19}$$

for

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en})=\|(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{g}^*)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_L)}+\|(\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*)\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L}+\|g_{en}\|_{\alpha,\Gamma_0}. \tag{3.20}$$

Proof. This lemma can be proved by adjusting arguments in [2], so we outline the idea of proof. For details, one can refer to [2, Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6].

Step 1. One can adjust the proof of [2, Lemma 3.5] to find constants $R\in(0,\frac{\min\{1,L\}}{10}]$ and $C>0$ depending only the background data, δ_0 and α so that

$$\int_{B_r(\mathrm{x}_0)\cap\Omega_L}|\nabla\mathfrak{u}|^2+|\nabla\mathcal{V}|^2\,d\mathrm{x}\le Cr^{2\alpha}[\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en})]^2 \tag{3.21}$$

holds for all $\mathrm{x}_0\in\overline{\Omega_L}$ and $r\in[0,R]$. Combining (3.21) with Lemma 3.3 gives

$$\|\mathfrak{u}\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L}+\|\mathcal{V}\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L}\le C\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en}). \tag{3.22}$$

Step 2. Substituting $\omega=0$ into (3.15), $\mathfrak{u}\in\{\zeta\in H^1(\Omega_L):\zeta|_{\Gamma_w\cup\Gamma_0}=0\}(=:\mathcal{H}_1)$ is regarded as a solution to

$$\int_{\Omega_L}\sum_{i=1}^{2}a_{ii}\partial_i\mathfrak{u}\partial_i\zeta\,d\mathrm{x}=\int_{\Omega_L}\mathfrak{F}^\sharp\cdot\nabla\zeta-\mathfrak{f}\zeta\,d\mathrm{x}+\int_{\Gamma_0}\mathfrak{F}_1^\sharp\zeta\,dx_2\ \text{ for all }\ \zeta\in\mathcal{H}_1 \tag{3.23}$$

where we set

$$\mathfrak{F}^\sharp=(\mathfrak{F}_1^\sharp,\mathfrak{F}_2^\sharp)=\mathfrak{F}^*-(b_1,b_2)\mathcal{V}. \tag{3.24}$$

We use this expression, (3.22) and adjust the proofs of [10, Lemma 1.41, Theorems 3.1 and 3.13] to obtain

$$\|\mathfrak{u}\|_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L}\le C\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en}) \tag{3.25}$$

where the constant C is chosen depending only on the background data, δ_0 and α.

Step 3. Substituting $\zeta=0$ into (3.15), $\mathcal{V}\in\{\omega\in H^1(\Omega):\omega|_{\Gamma_L}=0\}(=:\mathcal{H}_2)$ is regarded as a solution to

$$\int_\Omega\nabla\mathcal{V}\cdot\nabla\omega\,d\mathrm{x}=\int_\Omega\mathfrak{G}^*\cdot\nabla\omega-\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^*\omega\,d\mathrm{x}-\int_{\Gamma_0}g_{en}\omega\,dx_2\ \text{ for all }\ \omega\in\mathcal{H}_2$$

where we set $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^*=\mathfrak{g}^*+(c_1,c_2)\cdot\nabla\mathfrak{u}+d\mathcal{V}$. Combining Lemma 3.2, (3.22) and (3.25) yields

$$\|\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^*\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_L)}\le C\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en}).$$

With the help of the compatibility condition (1.29), we can extend $\mathcal{V}$ evenly with respect to the insulated boundary near the corner points $\bar{\Gamma_w}\cap\bar{\Gamma_L}$. Adjusting the proofs of [10,

Lemma 1.41, Theorems 3.1 and 3.13] again, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{V}\|_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} \le CM(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en}).$$

□

Remark 3.5. *According to* [10, Theorem 3.13]*, for* $\alpha \in (0,1)$*, Lemma 3.4 is still valid when the definition of* $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en})$ *in* (3.20) *is replaced by*

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,g_{en}) = \|(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{g}^*,g_{en})\|_{L^q(\Omega_L)} + \|(\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*)\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|g_{en}\|_{\alpha,\Gamma_0}$$

with $q = \frac{2}{1-\alpha}$*. This will be used in Section 4.*

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Given $(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{F})$, let $\mathfrak{F}^*,\mathfrak{G}^*,\mathfrak{g}^*$ be given by (3.11). Then, Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 imply that there exists unique weak solution $(\mathfrak{u},\mathcal{V}) \in \mathcal{H}$ of the problem (3.8)–(3.10) which satisfies (3.19). It follows from (3.11) that $\mathfrak{F}^\sharp$ given by (3.24) satisfies the estimate

$$\|\mathfrak{F}^\sharp\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} \le C\left(\|\mathfrak{F}\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|\mathfrak{h}\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L} + \|\Psi_{bd}\|^{(-1-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}_{2,\alpha,\Gamma_L} + \|g_{en}\|_{\alpha,\Gamma_0}\right). \tag{3.26}$$

According to (3.23), $\mathfrak{u}$ is a weak solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{2}\partial_i(a_{ii}\partial_i\mathfrak{u}) = \mathrm{div}\mathfrak{F}^\sharp + \mathfrak{f} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L \\ \mathfrak{u} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega_L\setminus\Gamma_0, \qquad \mathfrak{u}_{x_1} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L. \end{cases} \tag{3.27}$$

Therefore, we can follow the argument of the proof of [2, Proposition 3.1] to conclude that $\mathfrak{u} \in C^2(\Omega_L)$ and $\mathfrak{u}$ satisfies (3.27) pointwisely in $\overline{\Omega_L}\setminus\Gamma_w$. For any fixed $\mathrm{x}_0 \in \overline{\Omega_L}\setminus\Gamma_w$, define $d = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{x}_0,\Gamma_w)$ and a scaled function

$$\mathfrak{u}^{(\mathrm{x}_0)}(\mathrm{y}) := \frac{1}{d^{1+\alpha}}\left(\mathfrak{u}(\mathrm{x}_0+d\mathrm{y}) - \mathfrak{u}(\mathrm{x}_0) - d\nabla\mathfrak{u}(\mathrm{x}_0)\cdot\mathrm{y}\right)$$

for $\mathrm{y} \in \{\mathrm{y} \in B_1(\mathbf{0}) : \mathrm{x}_0 + d\mathrm{y} \in \Omega_L\} =: \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathrm{x}_0)$. Applying the standard elliptic estimate [8] and Lemma 3.4 yields

$$\|\mathfrak{u}^{(\mathrm{x}_0)}\|_{2,\alpha,\mathfrak{B}_{1/2}(\mathrm{x}_0)} \le C\left(\|\mathfrak{F}^\sharp\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|\mathfrak{f}\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L}\right).$$

This, together with (3.26), gives

$$\|\mathfrak{u}\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L} \le C\left(\|\mathfrak{F}\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|\mathfrak{h}\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L} + \|\Psi_{bd}\|^{(-1-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}_{2,\alpha,\Gamma_L} + \|g_{en}\|_{\alpha,\Gamma_0}\right). \tag{3.28}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.11) and (3.28) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathcal{V}\|_{2,\alpha,\Omega}^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}\\&\leq C\left(\|\mathfrak{F}\|_{1,\alpha,\Omega}^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}+\|\mathfrak{h}\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L}+\|\Psi_{bd}\|_{2,\alpha,\Omega}^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}+\|\mathfrak{g}\|_{\alpha,\Omega}+\|g_{en}\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0}^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_0)}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{3.29}$$

The estimate constant C in (3.28) and (3.29) depends only on the background data, δ_0 and α.

Finally, (3.5) easily follows from (3.6), (3.28) and (3.29). □

4. Existence and uniqueness for nonlinear problems

We prove Theorem 2 by Schauder fixed point theorem. Since Eq.(2.15) is coupled with the transport equation (2.22) through a derivative of S, the uniqueness is proved under additional condition (2.9).

Fix $\alpha\in(0,1)$. Given a constant $\delta>0$ to be determined later, define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}_\delta:=\{(\phi,\Psi)\in[C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega_L})]^2:\phi(x_1,-1)=0,\ \partial_{x_1}\phi(x_1,1)=0,\\ \|(\phi,\Psi)\|_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}\leq\delta\}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $S_{en}\in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Gamma_0})$. There exist a constant $\delta_1>0$ such that if $\delta\leq\delta_1$ and $(\tilde\phi,\tilde\Psi)\in\mathcal{K}_\delta$, then the problem*

$$\nabla^\perp(\psi_0+\tilde\phi)\cdot\nabla S=0\quad\text{in }\Omega_L,\quad S=S_{en}\quad\text{on }\Gamma_0\tag{4.1}$$

has a unique solution $S\in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega_L})$. Furthermore, S satisfies

$$\|S-S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L}\leq C\|S_{en}-S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0}\tag{4.2}$$

for a constant $C>0$ depending only on the background data.

Proof. Fix $(\tilde\phi,\tilde\Psi)\in\mathcal{K}_\delta$ and set $\tilde\psi=\psi_0+\tilde\phi$. Let $\delta_1=\frac{m_0}{4}$. If $\delta\in(0,\delta_1)$, then

$$\frac{3}{4}m_0\leq\tilde\psi_{x_2}\leq\frac{5}{4}m_0\quad\text{in}\quad\overline{\Omega_L}.\tag{4.3}$$

The boundary condition $\tilde\psi_{x_1}(x_1,\pm1)=0$ combined with (4.3) yields

$$\tilde\psi(0,-1)\leq\tilde\psi(x_1,x_2)\leq\tilde\psi(0,1)\quad\text{in}\quad\overline{\Omega_L}.$$

Set $I_{\tilde\psi}:=[\tilde\psi(0,-1),\ \tilde\psi(0,1)]$. The implicit function theorem implies that for any $x_1\in[0,L]$ and $\xi\in I_{\tilde\psi}$, there exists a unique $\pi(x_1,\xi)\in[-1,1]$ satisfying

$$\tilde\psi(x_1,\pi(x_1,\xi))=\xi,$$

and $\pi(x_1,\xi)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to x_1 and ξ. Therefore, for any $(x_1,x_2)\in\overline{\Omega_L}$, there exists a unique $\theta\in[-1,1]$ such that

$$\tilde{\psi}(x_1,x_2)=\tilde{\psi}(0,\theta) \tag{4.4}$$

holds. Note that $\mathscr{F}_{(\tilde{\psi})}(\theta):=\tilde{\psi}(0,\theta)$ is an invertible function from $[-1,1]$ onto $I_{\tilde{\psi}}$. Thus (4.4) gives

$$\theta(x_1,x_2)=\mathscr{F}^{-1}_{(\tilde{\psi})}\circ\tilde{\psi}(x_1,x_2)=:\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}(x_1,x_2)\quad\text{in}\quad\overline{\Omega_L} \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\nabla\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}(x_1,x_2)=\frac{\nabla\tilde{\psi}(x_1,x_2)}{\tilde{\psi}_{x_2}(0,\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}(x_1,x_2))}. \tag{4.6}$$

It follows from (4.1) and (4.5) that S is given by

$$S(x_1,x_2)=S_{en}\circ\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}(x_1,x_2).$$

It is easy to see that $\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}$ is well defined by (4.5) for all $(\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi})\in\mathcal{K}_\delta$ whenever $0<\delta\le\delta_1$. Moreover, by the choice of δ_1 and (4.6), $\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}$ satisfies the estimate

$$\|\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}\|_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L}\le Cm_0. \tag{4.7}$$

Since S_0 is a constant, $S-S_0$ can be written as $S-S_0=(S_{en}-S_0)\circ\mathscr{L}^{(\tilde{\psi})}$ in Ω_L. Thus the estimate (4.2) is a direct consequence of (4.7). □

Now we are in position to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2 (a): If $\delta\in(0,\frac{m_0}{4})$, then for any given $(\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi})\in\mathcal{K}_\delta$, the problem (4.1) has a unique solution in $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega_L})$. Let $\tilde{S}$ be the solution of (4.1). there exists a constant $\delta_2>0$ depending on the background data and α such that if $\max\{\delta,\|S_{en}-S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0}\}\le\delta_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\mathbf{F}}=\mathbf{F}(\mathrm{x},\nabla\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi},\tilde{S}),\quad \tilde{f}=f(\mathrm{x},\nabla\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi},\tilde{S},\tilde{S}_{x_2}),\\&\tilde{g}=g(\mathrm{x},\nabla\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi},\tilde{S}),\quad \tilde{h}=h(\mathrm{x},\nabla\tilde{\phi},\tilde{S})\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

are well defined in Ω_L where $\mathbf{F}$, f, g and h are defined by (2.19)–(2.21) and (2.24). Moreover, there exists a constant C depending only on the background data and α such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\tilde{\mathbf{F}}\|^{(-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L}+\|\tilde{f}\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L}+\|\tilde{g}\|_{\alpha,\Omega_L}\le C\left(\|S_{en}-S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0}+\delta\|(\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi})\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}\right),\\&\|\tilde{h}\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L}\le C\left(\|p_{ex}-\bar{p}(L)\|^{(-\alpha,\partial\Gamma_L)}_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_L}+\|S_{en}-S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Gamma_0}+\delta\|(\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi})\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

By Proposition 3.1 and (4.9), the boundary value problem for the elliptic system

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1(\phi,\Psi)=\tilde{f}+\mathrm{div}\tilde{\mathbf{F}} \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\phi,\Psi)=\tilde{g} \end{cases} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L \tag{4.10}$$

with boundary conditions

$$\Psi_{x_1}=g_{en} \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \Psi=\Psi_{bd} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L, \quad \Psi_{x_2}=0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_w \tag{4.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_{x_1}=0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \phi=\int_{-1}^{x_2}\tilde{h}(z)\,dz \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L, \\ &\phi(x_1,-1)=0, \quad \phi(x_1,1)=\int_{-1}^{1}\tilde{h}(z)\,dz \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

has a unique solution $(\phi,\Psi)\in[C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega_L})\cap C^2(\Omega_L)]^2$. Furthermore, we have

$$\|(\phi,\Psi)\|_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}\le\mathscr{C}^*\left(\frac{\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex})}{\delta}+\|(\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi})\|_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}\right)\delta, \tag{4.13}$$

where the constant $\mathscr{C}^*>0$ depends on the background data, δ_0 and α.

Suppose that $\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex})\le\sigma$ with $\sigma>0$ to be determined. Set

$$\delta=M\sigma$$

for $M\ge1$ to be determined. Then, (4.13) implies

$$\|(\phi,\Psi)\|_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}\le\mathscr{C}^*(\frac{1}{M}+M\sigma)\delta.$$

Choose $\sigma_1<1$ and $M>1$ as follows:

$$M=4(\mathscr{C}^*+1), \quad \sigma_1=\min\{\frac{1}{M},\frac{\delta_1}{M},\frac{\delta_2}{M},\frac{1}{M^2},\frac{1}{2\mathscr{C}^*M}\}. \tag{4.14}$$

Under such choices of M and σ_1, if $\omega_1(G_{en},\Phi_{bd},S_{en},\mathscr{B}_{en},p_{ex})\le\sigma\le\sigma_1$, then we have

$$\|(\phi,\Psi)\|_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}\le\frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Thus we can define a mapping $\mathcal{J}:\mathcal{K}_\delta\to\mathcal{K}_\delta$ by

$$\mathcal{J}(\tilde{\phi},\tilde{\Psi})=(\phi,\Psi)$$

for the solution (ϕ,Ψ) to (4.10)–(4.12). Once we show that $\mathcal{J}$ has a fixed point in $\mathcal{K}_\delta$, then Theorem 2 (a) is proved.

Suppose that a sequence $\{(\phi_k,\Psi_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}\subset\mathcal{K}_\delta$ converges to $(\phi_\infty,\Psi_\infty)$ in $[C^{1,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{\Omega_L})]^2$, then we have $(\phi_\infty,\Psi_\infty)\in\mathcal{K}_\delta$. For each $k\in\mathbb{N}$, set

$$\mathscr{L}_k:=\mathscr{L}^{(\psi_0+\phi_k)}, \quad \mathscr{L}_\infty:=\mathscr{L}^{(\psi_0+\phi_\infty)}, \quad S_k:=S_{en}\circ\mathscr{L}_k, \quad S_\infty:=S_{en}\circ\mathscr{L}_\infty \tag{4.15}$$

where $\mathscr{L}^{(\psi)}$ is defined by (4.5). By (4.4) and (4.5), $\mathscr{L}_k - \mathscr{L}_\infty$ can be expressed as

$$(\mathscr{L}_k - \mathscr{L}_\infty)(\mathrm{x}) = \frac{(\phi_k - \phi_\infty)(\mathrm{x}) - (\phi_k - \phi_\infty)(0, \mathscr{L}_k(\mathrm{x}))}{\int_0^1 \partial_{x_2}(\psi_0 + \phi_\infty)(0, \mathscr{L}_\infty(\mathrm{x}) + t(\mathscr{L}_k - \mathscr{L}_\infty)(\mathrm{x}))\, dt}. \tag{4.16}$$

Thus $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\mathscr{L}_k - \mathscr{L}_\infty\|_{0,\Omega_L} = 0$. Furthermore, using (4.6) gives

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\mathscr{L}_k - \mathscr{L}_\infty\|_{1,\Omega_L} \le C \lim_{k\to\infty} \left((\|\mathscr{L}_k - \mathscr{L}_\infty\|_{0,\Omega_L})^{\alpha/2} + \|\phi_k - \phi_\infty\|_{1,\alpha/2,\Omega_L} \right) = 0. \tag{4.17}$$

This, together with (4.15), yields

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|S_k - S_\infty\|_{\alpha/2,\Omega_L} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \|\partial_{x_2} S_k - \partial_{x_2} S_\infty\|_{0,\Omega_L} = 0 \tag{4.18}$$

It follows from (2.19)–(2.21), (2.25), (4.8), (4.10), (4.18) and Lemma 3.4 that we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\mathcal{J}(\phi_k, \Psi_k) - \mathcal{J}(\phi_\infty, \Psi_\infty)\|_{1,\alpha/2,\Omega_L} = 0.$$

Therefore, the mapping $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{K}_\delta \to \mathcal{K}_\delta$ is continuous in $[C^{1,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega_L})]^2$. Since $\mathcal{K}_\delta$ is a closed, compact and convex subset of $[C^{1,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega_L})]^2$, Schauder fixed point theorem implies that $\mathcal{J}$ has a fixed point (ϕ^*, Ψ^*) in $\mathcal{K}_\delta$. Let S^* be the solution to (2.22) associated with $\phi = \phi^*$. Then, (ϕ^*, Ψ^*, S^*) is a solution to (2.15), (2.16), (2.22), (2.25), and (2.26). In addition, the estimate (4.13) together with the choices of M and σ yields the estimate (2.8).

Proof of Theorem 2 (b): Let (ϕ_1, Ψ_1, S_1) and (ϕ_2, Ψ_2, S_2) be two solutions to (2.15), (2.16), (2.22), (2.25), and (2.26) which satisfy

$$\|(\phi_j, \Psi_j)\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L} + \|S_j - S_0\|_{1,\alpha,\Omega_L} \le C\omega_1(G_{en}, \Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex}). \tag{4.19}$$

By the assumption (2.12), we have $\omega_2(\Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}) = \|S_{en} - S_0\|_{W^{2,\mu}(\Gamma_0)}$. Given $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\mu > 2$, choose $\mu_1 \in (2, \min(\mu, \frac{1}{1-\alpha}))$ and denote $\beta = \frac{1}{2}\min(\alpha, 1 - \frac{2}{\mu})$.

For each $j = 1, 2$, S_j can be represented as

$$S_j(\mathrm{x}) = S_{en} \circ \mathscr{L}^{(\psi_0+\phi_j)}(\mathrm{x}) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L. \tag{4.20}$$

For $j = 1, 2$, one has

$$f_j = f(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\phi_j, \Psi_j, S_j, \partial_{x_2} S_j), \quad (g_j, \mathbf{F}_j) = (g, \mathbf{F})(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\phi_j, \Psi_j, S_j), \quad h_j = h(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\phi_j, S_j).$$

Then $(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\Psi}) = (\phi_1 - \phi_2, \Psi_1 - \Psi_2)$ satisfy the system

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\Psi}) = (f_1 - f_2) + \mathrm{div}(\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2) \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\Psi}) = g_1 - g_2 \end{cases} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L$$

with boundary conditions

$$\hat{\Psi}_{x_1} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \hat{\Psi} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_L, \quad \hat{\Psi}_{x_2} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_w,$$
$$\hat{\phi}_{x_1} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \ \hat{\phi}(\mathrm{x}) = \int_{-1}^{x_2} (h_1 - h_2)(z)\, dz \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_w \cup \Gamma_L.$$

Suppose that $\omega_1(G_{en}\Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}, p_{ex}) + \omega_2(\Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en}) \le \hat{\sigma}$ for $\hat{\sigma} > 0$ to be determined later. It follows from (4.16) and (4.20) that

$$\|S_1 - S_2\|_{\beta,\Omega_L} \le C\hat{\sigma}\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{1,\beta,\Omega_L}, \tag{4.21}$$

for $C > 0$ depending on the background data, α, and μ. For the rest of the section, a constant C may vary but depends only on the background data, α, and μ unless otherwise specified. For convenience, denote $\mathscr{L}^{(\psi_0+\phi_j)}$ by $\mathscr{L}_j$. Then $\partial_{x_2}(S_1 - S_2)$ can be written as

$$\partial_{x_2}(S_1 - S_2) = (S'_{en}(\mathscr{L}_1) - S'_{en}(\mathscr{L}_2))\, \partial_{x_2}\mathscr{L}_1 + S'_{en}(\mathscr{L}_2)\partial_{x_2}(\mathscr{L}_1 - \mathscr{L}_2). \tag{4.22}$$

It follows from (4.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|S'_{en}(\mathscr{L}_1) - S'_{en}(\mathscr{L}_2)\|_{L^\mu(\Omega_L)} \le& C\omega_2(\Phi_{bd}, S_{en}, \mathscr{B}_{en})\|\mathscr{L}_1 - \mathscr{L}_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_L)} \\ \le& C\hat{\sigma}\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{0,\Omega_L}.\end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\|\partial_{x_2}\phi_2(0, \mathscr{L}_2) - \partial_{x_2}\phi_2(0, \mathscr{L}_1)\|_{L^{\mu_1}(\Omega_L)} \le C\|\phi_2\|^{(-1-\alpha,\Gamma_w)}_{2,\alpha,\Omega_L}\|\mathscr{L}_1 - \mathscr{L}_2\|_{0,\Omega_L}. \tag{4.23}$$

Combining (4.22)–(4.23) with (4.19) gives

$$\|\partial_{x_2}(S_1 - S_2)\|_{L^{\mu_1}(\Omega_L)} \le C\hat{\sigma}\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{1,\beta,\Omega_L}.$$

This, together with (4.21), gives

$$\|(f_1 - f_2, g_1 - g_2)\|_{L^{\mu_1}(\Omega_L)} + \|\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2\|_{\beta,\Omega_L} + \|h_1 - h_2\|_{\beta,\Gamma_L} \le C\hat{\sigma}\|(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\Psi})\|_{1,\beta,\Omega_L}. \tag{4.24}$$

Hence it follows from Lemma 3.4, Remark 3.5 and (4.24) that

$$\|(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\Psi})\|_{1,\beta,\Omega_L} \le C_\natural\hat{\sigma}\|(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\Psi})\|_{1,\beta,\Omega_L} \tag{4.25}$$

for $C_\natural$ depending on the background data, α, μ and δ_0. Choose $\sigma_2 = \min(\sigma_1, \frac{3}{4C_\natural})$ so that, whenever $\hat{\sigma} \le \sigma_2$, (4.25) implies

$$(\phi_1, \Psi_1) = (\phi_2, \Psi_2) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_L.$$

This finishes the proof for Theorem 2. □

Acknowledgement. The research of Myoungjean Bae and Ben Duan was supported in part by Priority Research Centers Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) (NRF Project no.2013053914). The research of Myoungjean Bae was also supported by the Basic Science Research Program(NRF-2012R1A1A1001919) and TJ Park Science Fellowship of POSCO TJ Park Foundation. The research of Xie was supported in part by NSFC 11201297, Shanghai Chenguang program and Shanghai Pujiang program 12PJ1405200, and the Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of Higher Learning. Part of the work was done when Xie was visiting POSTECH and Bae and Duan visited Shanghai Jiao Tong University. They thank these institutions for their hospitality and support during these visit.

References

[1] U. M. Ascher, P. A. Markowich, P. Pietra, and C. Schmeiser, *A phase plane analysis of transonic solutions for the hydrodynamic semiconductor model*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **1** (1991), no. 3, 347–376.

[2] M. Bae, B. Duan and C. Xie, *Subsonic flow for multidimensional Euler-Poisson system* arXiv:1211.5234, submitted

[3] M. Bae, B. Duan and C. Xie, *Subsonic flow for full Euler-Poisson system in two dimensional nozzles*, arXiv:1309.3342, submitted

[4] M. Bae and M. Feldman, *Transonic shocks in multidimensional divergent nozzles*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* (2011), no. 3, 777–840.

[5] L. Caffarelli, A. Friedman, *The shape of axisymmetric rotating fluid*, J. Funct. Anal., **694** (1980), 109–142.

[6] S. Chandrasekhar, *Introduction to the Stellar Structure*, University of Chicago Press (1939).

[7] Y. Deng, T. P. Liu, T. Yang, Z. Yao, *Solutions of Euler-Poisson equations for gaseous stars*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **164** (2002), 261–285.

[8] D. Gilbarg, and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order.* 2nd Ed. Springer-Verlag: Berlin.

[9] A. Friedman and B. Turkington, *Existence and dimensions of a rotating white dwarf*, J. Diff. Eqns. **42** (1981), 414–437.

[10] Q. Han and F. Lin, *Elliptic partial differential equations.* Courant Institute of Math. Sci., NYU.

[11] J. Jang, *Nonlinear instability in gravitational Euler-Poisson systems for* $\gamma = \frac{6}{5}$, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **188** (2008), no. 2, 265–307.

[12] H. Li, P. A. Markowich and M. Mei, *Asymptotic behavior of subsonic entropy solutions of the isentropic Euler-Poisson equations*, Quart. Appl. Math. **60** (2002), no. 4, 773–796.

[13] Y. Y. Li, *On uniformly rotating stars*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **115** (1991), 367–393.

[14] G. Lieberman, *Hölder continuity of the gradient of solutions of uniformly parabolic equations with conormal boundary conditions*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **(4), 148** (1987), 77–99

[15] S. S. Lin, *Stability of gaseous stars in spherically symmetric motions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **28** (1997), no. 3, 539–569.

[16] T. Luo, J. Rauch, C. Xie and Z.-P. Xin, *Stability of transonic shock solutions for one-dimensional Euler-Poisson equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **202** (2011), no. 3, 787–827

[17] T. Luo and J. Smoller, *Rotating fluids with self-gravitation in bounded domains*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **173** (2004), no. 3, 345–377.

[18] T. Luo and J. Smoller, *Existence and Nonlinear Stability of Rotating Star Solutions of the Compressible Euler-Poisson Equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **191** (2009), no. 3, 447–496.

[19] T. Luo and J. Smoller, *Nonlinear Dynamical Stability of Newtonian Rotating and Non-rotating White Dwarfs and Rotating Supermassive Stars*, Comm. Math. Phys. 284 (2008), 425–457.

[20] T. Makino, *Blowing up of the Euler-Poisson equation for the evolution of gaseous star*, Transport Theory and Statistical Physics, **21** (1992), 615–624.

[21] R. McCann, *Stable rotating binary stars and fluid in a tube*, Houston J. Math., **32**(2006), 603–631.

[22] G. Rein, *Non-linear stability of gaseous stars*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **168** (2003), no. 2, 11–130.

[23] M. D. Rosini, *A phase analysis of transonic solutions for the hydrodynamic semiconductor model*, Quart. Appl. Math. **63** (2005), no. 2, 251–268.

[24] D. Wang, *Global Solutions and Stability for Self-Gravitating Isentropic Gases*, J. of Math. Anal. Appl., **229** (1999), 530–542.

[25] C. J. Xie, Z. P. Xin, Existence of global steady subsonic Euler flows through infinitely long nozzle, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **42** (2), 751–784, (2010)

M. Bae, Department of Mathematics, POSTECH, San 31, Hyojadong, Namgu, Pohang, Gyungbuk, Korea

E-mail address: mjbae@postech.ac.kr

B. Duan, Department of Mathematics, POSTECH, San 31, Hyojadong, Namgu, Pohang, Gyungbuk, Korea

E-mail address: bduan@postech.ac.kr

C. Xie, Department of mathematics, Institute of Natural Sciences, Ministry of Education Key Laboratory of Scientific and Engineering Computing, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 800 Dongchuan Road, Shanghai, China

E-mail address: cjxie@sjtu.edu.cn